

The Examiner relies on Hendrickson as teaching a right angle gear mechanism 60+62 and a wet, slip clutch assembly 64. Notably, the clutch assembly 64 appears either to be integrally formed with worm gear 62 or acting directly on worm gear 62.

Neither Hoff nor Hendrickson teach a system where the clutch is disposed between the right angle gear mechanism and the power shaft as claimed by Applicant. For the foregoing reason, a combination of the two references does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. Hence the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hoff ('994) in view of Hendrickson ('641) should be withdrawn and the claims passed to allowance.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 8 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hoff ('994) in view of Hendrickson ('641) and in further view of Howard. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection on the grounds that the particular arrangement of components as recited in Applicant's claims, and in particular, the location of the clutch mechanism, is not taught or suggested in the combination of the cited references.

The Examiner relies on Hoff and Hendrickson as set forth above, and further relies on Howard as teaching the external nature of certain claim elements. Again, neither Hoff nor Hendrickson nor Howard teaches a system where the clutch is disposed between the right angle gear mechanism and the power shaft as claimed by Applicant. For the foregoing reason, a combination of the three references does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. Hence the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hoff ('994) in view of Hendrickson ('641) and in further view of Howard should be withdrawn and the claims passed to allowance.

All of Applicant's arguments are without prejudice or disclaimer. Additionally, Applicant has merely discussed example distinctions from the prior art references. Other distinctions may exist, and Applicant reserves the right to discuss these additional distinctions in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements. The example distinctions discussed by Applicant are sufficient to overcome the rejections.

CONCLUSION

Authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account No. 10-0096 for any deficiency of fees.

The practitioner, named below, is authorized to file correspondence in the above-identified application pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.34(a).

The Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned for a teleconference to resolve any outstanding issues, as this Response is believed to put the case in condition for allowance. At this time and in view of Applicants' amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.

/Mark A. Tidwell/
Mark A. Tidwell
Reg. No. 37,456
1401 McKinney Street, Suite 1900
Houston, Texas 77010
Phone: (713) 752-4578
Fax: (713) 308-4162
Attorneys for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being Transmitted via the Office Electronic Filing System in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(a)(4). The undersigned has a reasonable basis to expect that the correspondence will be transmitted on or before the date indicated. (37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)).

Date: December 8, 2008

/Mark Tidwell/
Mark Tidwell